

using to the second tactile feedback as an indication of the output of the sensor no longer being varied.

RE
~~24. A method according to claim 23 further including receiving of said second tactile feedback and using said second tactile feedback as indication the sensor is no longer being varied and acting by increasing the pressing force to receive another tactile feedback and again vary the output of the sensor.~~

REMARKS

Regarding the Office Action Summary: This page has been reviewed, and it is noted claims 1-7 are rejected yet pending.

Regarding page 2, point 1 of the Office Action: The language in claim 7 has been deleted by the claim amendments above.

Regarding page 2, points 2 and 3 of the Office Action: The rejection of the now cancelled claims 1-6 under the nonstatutory double patenting doctrine is noted. Regarding the instant claims as amended above and the claims of Applicant's U.S. Patents 5,999,084; 6,102,802 and 6,135,886; while nonstatutory or statutory double patenting does not appear to now be present, Applicant does not wish, after issuance of this application as a patent, to need to fend off a wrongful Court challenge on the grounds of double patenting. There are many unjust attacks on the validity of patents today, and Applicant does not want an expensive wrongful double patenting attack in the future. Therefore, while the enforceable period of the patent will be reduced somewhat, the reduced period would be acceptable to eliminate an unjust and expensive attack on my Patent (issuing from this application). I have herewith submitted a Terminal Disclaimer and fee payment for each of the three patents 5,999,084; 6,102,802 and 6,135,886 relative to the instant application and the patent which will issue therefrom. Please apply these Terminal Disclaimers.

Regarding page 3, points 4, 5, and 6 of the Office Action:
this has been noted.

Regarding page 3, points 4, 5, 6 and 7 on page 4 of the Office Action: Claims 1-7 have been canceled in the above presented amendments and new claims 8-24 added.

The new claims 8-24 are all believed to be allowable over the prior art. No prior art single disclosure teaches or suggests the present claimed invention. No reasonable combination of the prior art teaches or suggests the present claimed invention, and allowance of claim 8-24 is therefore solicited.

More specifically regarding the prior art, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Kambic discloses the claimed invention except for the cap being a dome. Kambic is also just an On and then Off switch. There is no indication in the Kambic document that the material 7 relative to contact 4 and 5 is capable of anything other than ON or OFF electrical states (conducting and not conducting), and there is no indication that the material 7 of the keyboard switch of Kambic is analog capable. Kambic states material 7 "conducts vertically but not laterally", see Kambic line 9, indicating Kambic is only interested in whether material 7 conducts or does not conduct. The Kambic material 7 is "laterally conducting when it is compressed" see line 11, thus clearly Kambic is only interested whether material 7 conducts or does not conduct between contact 4 and 5 as a simple ON/OFF only keyboard switch. The On and then Off switch of Kambic is used in a keyboard in "a conventional row and column encoding matrix". To Applicant's knowledge, a conventional row and column encoding matrix in a keyboard is not conventionally used with a plurality of variable signal analog sensors which are read as analog sensors, as opposed to being read as either On or Off, but, because the Kambic switch is an On and then Off switch, a conventional row and column will work with his switch. Kramer,

while apparently including analog output, does not have a dome shaped cap or tactile feedbacks alerting the user of actuation and then deactuation of the varying of the analog output. Kambic also differs from the present invention by not having a tactile feedback alerting the user of actuation and then deactuation of analog material. The present claims 8-24 include a user discernable feedback or a dome-cap specifically for creating and providing the human user a tactile feedback, whereas, Kambic is clearly trying to make sure that "if" there exists any clicking or the like such as "might" be produced by the Kambic spring 8, that any clicking or the like does not reach the user as a tactile sensation. Note: there is no mention in Kambic of a tactile feedback or the like being produced in his spring 8 of the On / Off switch. Kambic locates an air bag 10 between the spring 8 and key button 3, and then states that the air bag is like "conventional plastic packaging materials", see Kambic page 2. Packaging materials conventionally serve to eliminate or dampen vibration, therefore one can only conclude that Kambic is trying to make sure the user's finger is isolated from any possible tactile feedback. The isolation of a click or the like from the user makes it non-tactile when compared to the present invention. It appears Kambic is trying to create a structure for providing a sensation of typing-on-air, therefore Kambic's "feedback enhancement" must be the diminishment or elimination of any possible tactile feedback from the switching mechanism, and thus

Kambic teaches away from, or opposite to, the present invention regarding the aspect of first and second tactile feedbacks indicating actuation and deactuation. Thus, Kambic does not teach, anticipate or suggest the invention as claimed, but rather, teaches away from this important aspect. The Kambic disclosure directly "teaching away" from the present invention aspect of tactile feedbacks to the user on actuation and deactuation does not allow for a logical suggesting within the Kambic and Murata disclosures that a dome shape member of Murata

be built into Kambic to provide a tactile feedback to the user, it would clearly be against the teaching and suggestions of Kambic.

The present analog output sensor providing tactile feedbacks to the user upon actuation and deactuation of the variable analog output is not taught or suggested by either Kambic or Kramer or Murata, and is not suggested by any reasonable combination of suggestions in the prior art. Nei et al (GB 2058462), Mitchell, Hyodo, Parsons, Teruo, Pine et al, Fujita, and Tsuji et al do in fact disclose sensors, but none are the same of the present invention and there is no reasonable combination suggesting the present invention.

Analog pressure-sensitive variable-conductance material alters the conductivity thereof through a range dependant on force applied thereto so that the sensor has or is structured to provide the desired variable electrical output, i.e. analog output, and this does not mean varying from OFF to ON only. The present invention provides variable analog electrical output proportionally variable to applied varying pressure applied by a single human thumb or finger on the actuator positioned not only to apply pressure but also to receive the tactile feedbacks indicating the beginning of the varying and then the ending of the varying of the analog output so as to provide greatly improved control by the human user as detailed in the present specification. Such is not taught or suggested by the prior art, and therefore allowance of the present claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the herein amendments and remarks in favor of allowance, would the Examiner please reexamine my application and find the claims 8-24 as herein presented allowable over the prior art, thank you.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own